UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/556,455	11/10/2005	David J. Chatting	36-1948	1307
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 04/10/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			RUSH, ERIC	
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/556,455	CHATTING ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ERIC RUSH	2624	

TI MANUAC DATE (A):
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>01 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. 🔯 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>01 April 2009</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the
date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): while the proposed amendment would overcome the previous 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejections, the amendment will not be entered for the reasons above.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4 and 6-8</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
/Matthew C Bella/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624
- 1

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed claim amendments will not be entered because they raise new issues and change the scope of the claims which would require further search and reconsideration of the prior art of record. In response to applicant's arguments, they are not convincing "as being directed to the claims as proposed and not entered, and not the finally rejected claims." Furthermore, Applicant's Representative argues that Massarsky in view of Ramm et al. fail to teach determining a caricature level value in dependence on an intended size of the caricatured image to be generated. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that Massarsky, as cited in the previous action, does aid in the teaching of that stated limitation. Massarsky teaches wherein a warping effect is adjusted by increasing and/or decreasing control points of an image, i.e. altering an image size. Ramm et al. was relied upon to more distinctly point out and clarify wherein image features were enhanced dependent upon their overall size.